

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT SEATTLE

11 STEVEN N.S. CHEUNG, INC.,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
15 Defendant.

16 CASE NO. C04-2050RSM

17 ORDER GRANTING IN PART
18 AND DENYING IN PART
19 MOTION FOR SUMMARY
20 JUDGMENT

21 **I. INTRODUCTION**

22 This matter comes before the Court on defendant's Motion for Partial Summary
23 Judgment asking the Court to reduce plaintiff's claim by \$441,378.00.¹ (Dkt. #31). Defendant
24 argues that plaintiff does not have standing to recover \$69,365 seized from the personal
25 accounts of Mr. Steven Cheung, and that this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction with
26 respect to a payment of \$372,013.00 because that payment was made voluntarily by plaintiff
before any levy was issued. Plaintiff concedes that payments seized from the personal accounts

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1859
1860
1861
186

of Mr. Cheung in the amount of \$69,365 are not recoverable in this action.² (Dkt. #33 at 1 n. 1). However, plaintiff argues that there is a genuine issue of material fact as to whether the payment in the amount of \$372,013.00 was made voluntarily, and therefore opposes summary judgment on that issue.

For the reasons set forth below, the Court agrees with plaintiff and GRANTS defendant's motion IN PART and DENIES defendant's motion IN PART.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Background

Plaintiff, Steven N.S. Cheung, Inc., is a Washington State corporation. It is to be distinguished from the individual, Steven N.S. Cheung, who is a citizen of the United States, and co-defendant in a concurrent criminal action being litigated in this Court.

In late January of 2003, the United States issued a jeopardy assessment against Mr. Cheung for income tax liability for the calendar year 1993.³ (Dkt. #1 at 2). The actual amount of the assessment appears to be in dispute, but plaintiff alleges that the United States assessed \$1,466,918.00 upon Mr. Cheung. (Dkt. #1 at 2). Defendant then levied property of plaintiff, on the grounds that it is the alter ego, or nominee, of Mr. Cheung, and that Mr. Cheung is the beneficial owner of Cheung, Inc.⁴

After defendant had levied funds from accounts at Bank of America and Salomon Smith Barney ("Smith Barney"), plaintiff requested a final payoff amount for Mr. Cheung's tax debt.

² By the Court's calculation, the amounts conceded by plaintiff actually total \$69,768.88. (Dkt. #33 at 3) (conceding payments on April 11, 2003, in the amounts of \$69,240.46 and \$393.91, and payments on April 22, 2003, in the amounts of \$9.13 and \$125.38).

³ If the government believes that the collection of a tax will be jeopardized by delay, the Secretary of Treasury can immediately assess such deficiency. 26 U.S.C. §6861(a). This is known as a jeopardy assessment.

⁴ The property included funds from a Bank of America account and several Salomon Smith Barney accounts.

1 The IRS responded, and plaintiff then issued a check, at the same time requesting that the IRS
2 release any liens against plaintiff. The IRS revenue officer in charge of Mr. Cheung's case later
3 informed plaintiff that the IRS had failed to record any tax liens in the name of "Cheung, Inc"
4 due to a "glitch" in the system. He also apparently indicated that he made a personal judgment
5 call not to correct the error since payment was being made to satisfy the levy.

6 Plaintiff filed a request for an administrative hearing for the unlawful seizure of its
7 property on October 31, 2003. (Dkt. #1 at 2). However, the United States denied that request,
8 asserting that Cheung, Inc. had no right to any administrative hearings. (Dkt. #7 at 3). As a
9 result, plaintiff filed this wrongful levy suit.

10 Defendant moves for partial summary judgment in part on the basis that this Court lacks
11 jurisdiction over it with respect to payments made voluntarily. Specifically, defendant notes that
12 26 U.S.C. § 7426, the statute under which the instant action was brought, does not permit a
13 third party to seek recovery of funds that were voluntarily paid to the IRS in anticipation of a
14 levy. Defendant asserts that plaintiff's last payment in satisfaction of the outstanding tax liability
15 of Mr. Cheung was voluntary because no levy for that payment had been issued at the time it
16 was made.

17 **B. Motion to Supplement the Record**

18 As a threshold matter, this Court first addresses plaintiff's motion to supplement the
19 record. (Dkt. #49). Plaintiff has moved pursuant to Rule 56(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil
20 Procedure to supplement the instant record with portions of the deposition of Revenue Officer
21 Michael Kolpack. The deposition was taken after briefing on the instant motion had been
22 completed, but certain portions of Mr. Kolpack's testimony are directly relevant to the issues
23 now before this Court.

24 Defendant argues that the motion to supplement should be denied because plaintiff failed
25 to file a Rule 56(f) motion for a continuance to take Mr. Kolpack's deposition, and also because
26

1 the testimony is irrelevant. The Court is not persuaded.

2 Rule 56(f) does not apply to plaintiff's motion to supplement. That Rule governs
3 requests for discovery in order to adequately respond to a motion for summary judgment. Here,
4 plaintiff made no such representation. Rather, plaintiff asserts that new facts have come to light
5 and the Court would benefit from having the most complete record available to it when
6 resolving the instant motion for summary judgment. The Court agrees.

7 Accordingly, the Court will consider the deposition testimony, along with defendant's
8 substantive argument that it is irrelevant, when considering the motion for summary judgment.

9 **C. Motions to Strike**

10 Both plaintiff and defendant have moved to strike portions of the declarations in support
11 of each other's briefs. The Court addresses each in turn.

12 *1. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike*

13 Plaintiff moves to strike the Declaration of W. Carl Hankla that was submitted in support
14 of the instant motion for partial summary judgment. Plaintiff argues that the declaration does
15 not comply with Rule 56(e) because it is not clear that Mr. Hankla is competent to testify to the
16 matters therein, or that he has personal knowledge of the facts stated therein. The Court denies
17 the motion to strike on the basis that Mr. Hankla's declaration does nothing more than
18 authenticate documents from the IRS administrative file he has in his possession, and plaintiff
19 does not dispute such authenticity.

20 *2. Defendant's Motion to Strike*

21 Defendant moves to strike the Declaration of William P. Shanahan that was submitted in
22 support of plaintiff's opposition to the motion for summary judgment to the extent that Mr.
23 Shanahan asserts that the payment made in the amount of \$372,103 was made "pursuant to a
24 levy." The Court denies the motion to strike on the basis that it is not necessary to strike Mr.
25 Shanahan's statements in order for this Court to determine which facts are disputed or to

properly consider what evidence is admissible to demonstrate such a dispute.

D. Summary Judgment Standard

Summary judgment is proper where “the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247 (1986). The Court must draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the non-moving party. *See F.D.I.C. v. O’Melveny & Meyers*, 969 F.2d 744, 747 (9th Cir. 1992), *rev’d on other grounds*, 512 U.S. 79 (1994). The moving party has the burden of demonstrating the absence of a genuine issue of material fact for trial. *See Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 257. Mere disagreement, or the bald assertion that a genuine issue of material fact exists, no longer precludes the use of summary judgment. *See California Architectural Bldg. Prods., Inc., v. Franciscan Ceramics, Inc.*, 818 F.2d 1466, 1468 (9th Cir. 1987).

Genuine factual issues are those for which the evidence is such that “a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the non-moving party.” *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248. Material facts are those which might affect the outcome of the suit under governing law. *See id.* In ruling on summary judgment, a court does not weigh evidence to determine the truth of the matter, but “only determine[s] whether there is a genuine issue for trial.” *Crane v. Conoco, Inc.*, 41 F.3d 547, 549 (9th Cir. 1994) (citing *O’Melveny & Meyers*, 969 F.2d at 747). Furthermore, conclusory or speculative testimony is insufficient to raise a genuine issue of fact to defeat summary judgment. *Anheuser-Busch, Inc. v. Natural Beverage Distributors*, 60 F. 3d 337, 345 (9th Cir. 1995). Similarly, hearsay evidence may not be considered in deciding whether material facts are at issue in summary judgment motions. *Anheuser-Busch, Inc. v. Natural Beverage Distribbs.*, 69 F.3d 337, 345 (9th Cir. 1995); *Blair Foods, Inc. v. Ranchers Cotton Oil*, 610 F. 2d 665, 667 (9th Cir. 1980).

1 **E. Plaintiff's Conceded Claim**

2 Plaintiff does not oppose defendant's motion for summary judgment as to the payments
 3 collected by the IRS that resulted from the levies on Mr. Cheung's personal accounts. As noted
 4 above, by the Court's calculation, the amounts conceded by plaintiff total \$69,768.88. (Dkt.
 5 #33 at 3) (conceding payments on April 11, 2003 in the amounts of \$69,240.46 and \$393.91,
 6 and payments on April 22, 2003, in the amounts of \$9.13 and \$125.38). Accordingly, the Court
 7 will grant summary judgment in favor of defendant on this issue.

8 **F. Jurisdiction to Recover Voluntary Payment**

9 Defendant next argues that this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction with respect to the
 10 payment of \$372,013.00 made by plaintiff in May 2003 to satisfy the outstanding tax liability of
 11 Mr. Cheung. Defendant asserts that the payment was made voluntarily because no levy had
 12 been issued at the time that amount was paid.

13 Plaintiff responds that a levy did exist, or, in the alternative, a genuine issue of material
 14 fact exists as to whether the payment was made voluntarily or pursuant to a levy. As further
 15 discussed below, the Court agrees.

16 When the IRS levies a plaintiff's property to pay the tax liabilities of a third party, the
 17 exclusive remedy for such plaintiff is a wrongful levy action under 26 U.S.C. § 7426(a).

18 *Denham v. United States*, 811 F. Supp. 497, 500 (C.D. Cal. 1992). "To bring a lawful levy suit,
 19 Plaintiff must show that there was a levy." *Id.* (citation omitted).

20 Defendant argues that when plaintiff gave the IRS a payoff check for \$372,013.00 in
 21 May 2003, the levies on plaintiff's accounts at the Bank of America and Smith Barney had
 22 already occurred, and the IRS had not served any additional notices of levy. Accordingly,
 23 defendant asserts that the payment was made voluntarily, and this case lacks jurisdiction.
 24 Defendant relies on *Interfirst Bank Dallas, N.A. v. United States*, 769 F.2d 299 (5th Cir. 1986),
 25 *cert. denied*, 475 U.S. 1081 (1986), wherein the court determined that the threat of levy

1 combined with a voluntary payment was not a constructive levy of the property at issue, and
 2 therefore, the court had no jurisdiction.

3 However, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has distinguished that case from instances
 4 where there is a notice of levy. *See Denham*, 811 F. Supp. at 500-01. In *Denham*, the court
 5 explicitly stated that a “levy may be made by means of a notice of levy.”⁵ *Id.* at 500 (citation
 6 omitted). In the instance case, plaintiff has produced a Notice of Jeopardy Levy and Right of
 7 Appeal to plaintiff as nominee of Mr. Cheung on February 5, 2003. (Dkt. #51, Ex. A). The
 8 letter states that the IRS has approved the issuance of a levy to collect the amount “you owe.”
 9 (Dkt. #51, Ex. A at 1). The letter appears to apply to all property owned by plaintiff, and does
 10 not distinguish the specific accounts at Bank of American and Smith Barney. The letter also
 11 states that the references in the letter to notices of intent to levy do not apply “because such
 12 notice is not required when collection is in jeopardy.” (Dkt. #51, Ex. A at 2) (emphasis added).
 13 Plaintiff also produces testimony from Mr. Kolpack that he told plaintiff unless it came up with a
 14 voluntary plan, he would use any and all means available to locate sources of income and
 15 interest in assets to levy against them. (Dkt. #50, Ex. B at 140).⁶

16 Without citing to any authority, defendant responds that the Notice of Jeopardy Levy
 17 does not constitute an actual levy on the assets of the plaintiff as it is just a notice of the issuance
 18 of a levy on Bank of America. (Dkt. #60 at 3 n. 2). Notwithstanding the fact that the notice
 19 does not refer to any specific property, based on the Ninth Circuit’s explicit statement that levy
 20 may be made by means of a notice of levy, in *Denham, supra*, that argument is without merit.
 21 *Denham*, 811 F. Supp. At 500; *see also United Pacific Insurance Co. v. United States*, 320 F.
 22 Supp. 450, 451 (D. Ore. 1970) (finding that notice of lien was equivalent to notice of levy

23
 24 ⁵ The court then explained that because the IRS had not issued a notice of levy, and because
 plaintiff had failed to demonstrate a constructive levy, the court had no jurisdiction.

25
 26 ⁶ The Court cites to the deposition page number of Mr. Kolpack located in the upper right hand
 corner of the deposition transcript.

1 because the IRS accompanied the notice of lien with a letter headed "Tax Levy.") Accordingly,
2 the Court finds jurisdiction in this case, and denies defendant's motion for summary judgment on
3 that issue.

4 **III. CONCLUSION**

5 Having reviewed defendant's motion for partial summary judgment, plaintiff's response
6 and motion to supplement the record, defendant's reply and opposition to the motion to
7 supplement, and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby ORDERS:

- 8 (1) Plaintiff's Motion to Supplement (Dkt. #49) is GRANTED.
9 (2) Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. #31) is GRANTED IN
10 PART and DENIED IN PART as follows:
11 a. The Court GRANTS summary judgment in favor of defendant with respect to its
12 argument that plaintiff does not have standing to recover funds that were levied from Mr.
13 Cheung's personal accounts.
14 b. The Court denies summary judgment with respect to its argument that this Court
15 lacks jurisdiction over the payment made by plaintiff in the amount of \$372,013.00.
16 (3) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to all counsel of record.

17 DATED this 28th day of July, 2006.

18 
19 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26